



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. XCII.

JULY, 1836.

- ART. I. — 1. *A History of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, from its Exploration and Settlement by the Whites, to the Close of the Northwestern Campaign, in 1813 ; with an Introduction, exhibiting the Settlement of Western Virginia from the first Passage of the Whites over the Mountains of Virginia in 1736, to the Treaty of Camp Charlotte, near Chillicothe, Ohio, in 1774.* By MANN BUTLER. Second Edition ; revised and enlarged by the Author. Cincinnati ; published by J. A. James and Co. Louisville ; by the Author. 1836.
2. *Sketches of History, Life, and Manners in the West.* By JAMES HALL. In Two Volumes. Philadelphia ; Harrison Hall, 62 Walnut Street. 1835.

Two works on the important subject of Western History. Both of them are valuable, and we hail them as useful additions to the scanty library which contains our historical records. They are useful, however, in different ways. Mr. Butler's work contains the fruit of much patient research among family records, and public and domestic archives ; and is a storehouse of facts and documents, far the most complete which has yet been given us upon western annals. It is the most thorough book on the subject. It is, what it professes to be, a history. The work of Judge Hall is written in his usual easy and grace-

ful style ; it is calculated to interest readers who would not venture upon a regular history ; without being very profound, it has an air of philosophy, well adapted to a parlour fireside ; without much accuracy, it rambles over the whole ground, so as to satisfy an easy curiosity. It is the most entertaining book on the subject. It is, what it professes to be, a collection of sketches.

Judge Hall is a popular writer. He is known to the public by various essays and tales, which have appeared from time to time in periodicals. He is also the Editor of "The Western Magazine." A year or two since he published a novel, called the "Harpe's Head." He professes to be a western man ; the scene of his stories is generally in the west ; his incidents are taken from western life ; but of the western character he knows little, and of the western spirit he possesses nothing. He wants the intellectual *openness*, which would enable him to catch the spirit of society. His mind is shut up in its own ways of thinking and feeling, and his writings, in consequence, give no true reflection of western character. In this respect, he is the exact antithesis of Timothy Flint, whose writings, though sometimes inaccurate in detail, are always charged full with a western spirit. Flint's "Ten Years' Residence" is one of our few genuine national works. It could have been written nowhere but in the Western Valley. It could have been written by no one, whose mind had not been moulded by a constant contact with western scenery and people. Judge Hall's books might all have been composed by one who had never been beyond the atmosphere of London, but who had heard a few anecdotes and read a few works about the western world. Judge Hall should not have been so positive in asserting in the Preface to the book before us, "that the works which have professed to treat of the whole western region have been failures." He will have added to his already well-earned fame, when he shall have produced such a "failure" as Mr. Flint's "Ten Years' Residence in the Mississippi Valley."

Judge Hall is not an accurate writer. In the work before us (Vol. I. p. 247), he informs us that Sir William Johnson purchased of the Six Nations, in 1768, their claim to the lands on the *northwest* side of the Ohio to the Great Miami. This does not appear on the treaty. Page 251 represents two grants from the Cherokees to Henderson and his company ; whereas

it appears there was only one, the other being a grant to the Crown in 1770. On page 31 (Vol. II.) he alters the date of the purchase of Louisiana, from 1803 to 1795, probably confounding it with the Spanish treaty of 1795. On page 36, he comes to the conclusion, that there was nothing treasonable in the Spanish conspiracy on a dispassionate consideration of "the whole matter." But in this dispassionate consideration, he has wholly omitted the most treasonable features, saying nothing of the proposal made through Power in 1797 to withdraw from the Federal Union, and to form a government "wholly unconnected with that of the Atlantic States"; nothing of the one hundred thousand dollars offered to Sebastian as a bribe to bring about this; and nothing of the concealment of the whole matter, by all concerned. All this looks a little treasonable. On page 119 he calls Kaskaskia a garrisoned town, when the fort was unoccupied, and the town defended only by militia; and, on page 124, he tells us that the capture of Vincennes in 1779 led to the settlement of Louisville in 1778. These are small matters; but Judge Hall should pluck the beam out of his own eye, before he undertakes to be severe on "careless writers."

Judge Hall, in attempting to make out a theory which characterizes the intercourse of the Americans with the Indians as habitually cruel and unfaithful, has brought an accusation against the Pilgrims of New England so grossly inaccurate, that we cannot let it pass unnoticed. After praising them for various qualities, he goes on to say, that "the perversion of public opinion which could lead such men, themselves the victims of oppression, and the assertors of liberal principles, *to treat the savages as brutes*, must have been wide spread and deeply seated; yet such was certainly their conduct."

The Italics are ours. But this charge filled us, on reading it, with surprise. We tried to recall the events in New England annals, which might justify such a sweeping assertion. Was it John Eliot who treated the Indians like brutes in his labors among them for their conversion, — labors, the like of which, for intensity of love, have not been seen since the apostolic times? Or was that touching visit of Edward Winslow to the sick Sachem Massasoit, and his tender nursing of him, "treating him like a brute?" It has always seemed to us more like the parable of the good Samaritan. But the author acknowledges, himself, the unquestioned fact, that for forty years the

New-Englanders lived in peace with all the Indians but the Pequots. They could hardly, one would think, have lived thus, if they were in the habit of treating them like brutes. He tells us, "there were several periods at which they (the Indians) could with ease have exterminated all the colonists." That they did not, he brings as a proof of their peaceable and friendly disposition. But does he really think that the Indians, in New-England, or elsewhere, have ever been of so extremely forgiving and pacific a temper as to spare those who treated them like brutes, when they had them wholly in their power?

To prove the ingratitude of the English for this Indian kindness, the war with the Pequots and its consequences are produced. Either Judge Hall is himself very ignorant of the early Indian history of New England, or he writes for those whom he believes ignorant of it. His argument stands thus. The Narragansets and Massachusetts tribes, neighbours of the Plymouth and Bay colonies, were friendly and kind; therefore, it was base ingratitude for the Pilgrims to go to war with the Pequots on the Connecticut, who were the deadly enemies of all of them. In the same way it might be reasoned; The French were very kind to us in the Revolutionary war; therefore it was base ingratitude to go to war with their enemies, the English, in 1812. We would not undertake to acquit the Pilgrims of all taint of the sternness and intolerance which belonged to their age. No New England historian ever does so. It was only last autumn, that in the presence of thousands, assembled to do honor to the remains of a body of whites, waylaid and massacred in King Philip's war by Philip's Indians, that the orator, standing in the defile where they fell beneath bullet and tomahawk, entered into a noble defence of the Indians who slew them. And of those listening thousands, whose heart did not beat, and whose eye did not fill, at the thrilling statement of the bitter sufferings which drove the Indian to desperation? The sympathy was as complete as Judge Hall himself could desire. But for all this, the Indians were *not* treated like brutes, nor with base ingratitude.

With these qualifying remarks, we recommend the "Sketches" to our readers as a work full of entertaining anecdote and description.

Mr. Butler's style is not so good as Judge Hall's. It frequently wants perspicuity; the sentences are sometimes badly constructed; superlatives are somewhat too frequent; the met-

aphors are sometimes in bad taste ; and the whole seems written in a hurry. This last appearance may explain all the rest, for there are parts, to which none of our objections apply, and which prove that Mr. Butler has the power of writing with smoothness, elegance, and force. But what shall we say to a sentence like this ? (p. 206.) “ The most distinguished man in this body, and who may emphatically be called the author of the first Constitution of Kentucky, was George Nicholas, the most eminent lawyer of his time in Kentucky, whether his learning or his powers of mind be regarded, and the father of the present Judge Nicholas.” We should have called this the worst possible construction of a sentence, did not the same volume supply a worse one ; for which, however, not Mr. Butler, but Humphrey Marshall is accountable. On page 121 we read, in a description of a battle which reminds us both of Homer and Knickerbocker ; “ And thus both sides firmly stood, or bravely fell, for more than one hour ; upwards of one fourth of the combatants had fallen never more to rise, on either side, and several others were wounded.” We take the following to be the worst metaphor in the book. “ There was one man who had the firmness, amidst the general delusion, to turn a deaf ear to the syren song of peace and farming, which was so artfully sung by Colonel Burr.” “ The syren song of peace and farming ” means the pretence of Burr, that he was not going to fight, but to cultivate the Washita lands.

In the higher qualities of an historian, however, Mr. Butler is deserving of all praise. In fairness, earnestness, and fidelity, he excels, as far as he falls behind in expression and outward dress. He writes, it seems to us, in a highly candid and impartial spirit. His book in this respect compares advantageously with the former history of Kentucky by Humphrey Marshall, which, though written with great force and in a picturesque style, is obnoxious to a charge of political partisanship, which, it may be owned, was hard to be escaped by one, who undertook to describe scenes, “ quorum pars magna fuit.” Marshall was a stern Federalist of the strictest sect. Mr. Butler inclines more to the Jefferson school, though an enlarged experience has taught him to qualify very much the maxims and notions of the “ Monticello sage,” which once were looked upon as containing all things necessary for political and social salvation. But, though candid, Mr. Butler is not indifferent. He is thoroughly in earnest, and treats his sub-

ject with enthusiasm. It is evidently a labor of love with him. And in this respect he is right. A cold, skeptical spirit, which seeks to explain away all that is noble and lofty in human achievements, is far from being the true historical spirit, though too often mistaken for it. It is only by sympathizing with the character of a people, by entering into the feelings which moved them, by giving ourselves up to the influences which impressed and swayed them, that we can rightly understand their history. Thus alone can we seize the great leading principles, the ruling ideas, which determine the course and destinies of a nation. Without this, a writer may give us effects, but the causes will be hidden from him. He can narrate facts, but he cannot give us principles. He can tell what a people *did*, but not what they *were*. He may be a good annalist, he cannot be a good historian.

But perhaps the most important requisite of a good historian in the present age of our country, and particularly of the Western country, is fidelity of research. The early records, the family traditions, even printed journals and the official accounts of legislative proceedings, are daily perishing for want of a little care and attention. Documents, which a century hence would be invaluable, are lost through carelessness and indifference. The best service which an historian can perform is to save such documents from this fate. How much is New England history indebted to Thomas Prince, for his "Chronology," which when first published could not find subscribers for the second volume, but which now is the only source of knowledge with regard to a large portion of the New England annals. Here again, Mr. Butler deserves our gratitude for the efforts he has made, and their success in procuring much new information. This is the chief worth of his book. The second edition is a great improvement on the first in this respect. The work was before incomplete, without beginning or end. It now contains the outline, at least, of every thing which we could wish. It has, in addition to the contents of the first edition, an Introduction in seventy-two pages, two more chapters at the end, and a large number of important documents, omitted in the former Appendix. The Introduction gives an account of early discoveries by the French and others in the Mississippi Valley, and the settlements of Western Virginia. This appears to us a more suitable opening than Rafinesque's "Ancient Annals of Kentucky," prefixed to

Marshall's *History*. That worthy antiquary, whose motto is "Nunquam otiosus," has given us an account of the inhabitants of Kentucky from the time of Adam, with a minute detail of the rise and fall of various dynasties, of invasions, revolutions, emigrations, through successive periods, *down* to the discovery of Columbus. Former historians, we know, always adopted this plan ; but of late years we are satisfied that as firm a foundation can be obtained by digging down a few feet, as if we went to the centre of the earth. And the only writer of modern times who has adopted Rafinesque's plan is, to the best of our recollection, the worthy author of "The History of New York." The first book of that renowned work is occupied with different cosmogonies and theories of the universe, deduced from the traditions of China, India, Egypt, Chaldea, and other equally authentic sources.

Mr. Butler has taken Marshall's *History* as the basis of his own. This work, which we noticed in a former Number, must always be considered the original fountain of Kentucky history. Mr. Marshall has been an actor in many scenes which he describes, and has heard descriptions of others from the lips of those engaged in them. Mr. Butler's chief additions to this work, consist in the before-named Introduction, an account of Indian treaties by which the soil of Kentucky was ceded to the whites, notices of Henderson's proprietary government, and a minute and interesting account of Gen. Clark's Illinois campaigns. In addition to this, he has diligently consulted original sources to confirm, explain, and rectify all the other portions of the history.

The first chapter of the *History* is devoted to an examination of the Indian title to Kentucky. Mr. Butler has brought to light a treaty, concluded at Fort Stanwix in the State of New York, in 1768, with the Six Nations, by the agency of that extraordinary man, Sir William Johnson. By this treaty, that powerful confederacy, who had extended their conquests west to the Mississippi, and south to the Tennessee River, relinquished to the English a large portion of the present State of Kentucky. The probability seems to be, that, though they had control of the territory at and after that time, till its occupation by the English, it was not taken possession of by any one Indian tribe, but was hunted over by all. Johnson was one of the few Englishmen who could manage a successful diplomacy with the Indians ; probably because he united cour-

teousness with firmness, and to independence and courage a respect for the feelings and opinions of the red man. To these qualities of Johnson it appears that the people of Kentucky owe a fair Indian title to their land. Such a title is little valued now, and still less was it considered in those days of the early emigrants.

“ For why ? Because the good old rule
Sufficed for them, the simple plan,
That those shall take, who have the power,
And those shall keep, who can.”

Yet we believe the days will come, when the people of every State in the Union will be proud to treasure up memorials, that their fathers were not unjust to the red man.

In parliamentary proceedings it is sometimes permitted to the Speaker to descend from his seat and take part in the discussion. Even so the Reviewer, who was originally a kind of presiding officer in the republican assembly of authors, placed apart to see that the rules of good writing were observed and to call to order those who infringed them, has of late plunged, himself, into the debate ; somewhat to the neglect, indeed, of his peculiar vocation. Having performed our duty as critics, we would use this privilege also. We would turn from the book to its subject, from the historian to the history. And the interesting point to us, in Western history, is the light which it throws upon Western character, so far as that character is now developed.

It is beginning to be generally understood that the Western people, and in particular the inhabitants of Kentucky, possess the germs of a very original and strongly-marked character. Various traits of mind and disposition are ascribed to them by travellers, journalists, and other writers. Among these are usually mentioned activity of intellect, versatility of talent, ease of manner, an independence of character which runs into the extreme of recklessness, and a freedom which often degenerates into lawlessness. Warm hospitality, ardent friendship, excitable feelings connect them with the South ; enterprise, self-reliance, and readiness of talent, remind us of New England. To be sure, this character is yet in an unformed state ; its ingredients are fermenting together ; but intelligent observers can distinguish plainly very strong and individual traits, which point at a high degree of future nationality.

But, in order to understand a work of art or nature, it always becomes necessary to look at the history of its formation. Would you comprehend the complicated machinery of a cotton factory, or gain insight into the action of a steam-engine, study them first in their simplest forms. See how inconveniences suggested alteration, and improvements grew out of necessities. The character of the adult is learned in the history of his boyhood, for "the child is father of the man." And thus national character can only be understood out of national history. Taking our stand on this ground, we will pass in review some of the striking events in the history of Kentucky.

We have not to go far back to find the commencement of this history. Those now alive, who have reached the age of seventy years, were born before the first white man entered Kentucky. For the English have never displayed the same love of discovery as the Spaniards and French, either in North or South America. Wherever they have fixed themselves, they remain. A love of adventure, an eager curiosity, a desire of change, or some like motive had carried the French all over the continent, while the English colonists continued quietly within their own limits. The French Missionaries coasted along the Lakes and descended the Mississippi, a whole century before the Virginians began to cross the Alleghany ridge, to get a glimpse of the noble inheritance which had remained undisturbed for centuries, waiting their coming.

It was not till the year 1767, only eight years before the breaking out of the revolutionary war, that John Finley of North Carolina descended into Kentucky for the purpose of hunting and trading. The feelings of wonder and delight experienced by this early pioneer in passing through the rich lands, which were filled with deer, buffaloes, and every kind of game, and covered with the majestic growth of centuries, soon communicated themselves to others. Like the spies who returned from Palestine, they declared, "The land, which we passed through to search it, is an exceeding good land." They compared it to parks and gardens, or a succession of farms, stocked with cattle and full of birds tame as farm-yard poultry. Instigated by these descriptions, in 1769 DANIEL BOONE, a man much distinguished for bravery and skill, entered

Kentucky. And now commenced a series of enterprise, romantic adventure, chivalric daring, and patient endurance, not surpassed in the history of modern times. Nothing in the tales of knight-errantry, in the "romans de longues haleines," which occupied the leisure of pages and squires in old baronial days, or in the Waverley novels and their "tail" of romances of the second class, which amuse modern gentlemen and ladies, nothing in these works of imagination can exceed the realities of early Kentucky history. From 1769 till Wayne's victory on the Maumee in 1794, a period of twenty-five years, including the whole revolutionary war, the people of Kentucky were engaged in Indian warfare, for life and home. Surrounded by an enemy far outnumbering them, deadly in hatred, of ferocious cruelty, wielding the same rifle with themselves, and as skilful in its use, they took possession of the country, felled the forest, built towns, laid out roads, and changed the wilderness into a garden. No man could open his cabin door in the morning, without danger of receiving a rifle bullet from a lurking Indian; no woman could go out to milk the cows without risk of having a scalping-knife at her forehead before she returned. Many a man returned from hunting, only to find a smoking ruin where he had left a happy home with wife and children. But did this constant danger create a constant anxiety? Did they live in terror? Fightings were without; were fears within? By no means. If you talk with the survivors of those days they will tell you; "We soon came to think ourselves as good men as the Indians. We believed we were as strong as they, as good marksmen, as quick of sight, and as likely to see them, as they were to see us; so there was no use in being afraid of them." The danger produced a constant watchfulness, an active intelligence, a prompt decision; traits still strongly apparent in the Kentucky character. By the same causes, other, more amiable and social qualities were developed. While every man was forced to depend on himself and trust to his own courage, coolness, and skill, every man felt that he depended on his neighbour for help in cases where his own powers could no longer avail him. And no man could decline making an effort for another, when he knew that he might need a like aid before the sun went down. Hence we have frequent examples of one man risking his life to save that of

another, and of desperate exertions made for the common safety of the dwellers in fort or stockade.

As an example of such generous exertions we extract the following anecdote, which has been frequently told, but is here given, by Mr. Butler, in the words of an actor.

“On the 7th of July, 1776, the Indians took out of a canoe which was in the river, within sight of Boonesborough, Miss Betsey Calloway, her sister Frances, and a daughter of Daniel Boone. The last two were about thirteen or fourteen years of age, and the other grown. The affair happened late in the afternoon, and the spoilers left the canoe on the opposite side of the river from us, which prevented our getting over for some time to pursue them. Next morning by day-light we were on the track; but found they had totally prevented our following them by walking some distance apart through the thickest cane they could find. We observed their course, and on which side they had left their sign, and travelled upwards of thirty miles. We then imagined they would be less cautious in travelling, and made a turn in order to cross their trace, and had gone but a few miles before we found their tracks in a buffalo path; we pursued and overtook them on going about ten miles, just as they were kindling a fire to cook. Our study had been more to get the prisoners without giving the Indians time to murder them after they discovered us, than to kill them. We discovered each other nearly at the same time. Four of us fired, and all rushed on them, which prevented their carrying any thing away except one shot gun without any ammunition. Mr. Boone and myself had a pretty fair shot just as they began to move off. I am well convinced I shot one through, and the one he shot dropped his gun; mine had none. The place was very thick with cane, and being so much elated on recovering the three little broken-hearted girls, prevented our making any further search. We sent them off without their moccasins, and not one of them so much as a knife or a tomahawk.” — Butler’s *History*, p. 32.

The three most distinguished men among the early settlers were James Harrod, Daniel Boone, and Benjamin Logan. Of the last-mentioned gentleman we insert the following anecdote. His fort was besieged by a large party of Indians in 1777. The garrison consisted of only fifteen men.

“The Indians made their attack on the fort with more than their usual secrecy. While the women, guarded by a party of the men, were milking the cows outside of the fort, they were suddenly fired upon by a large body of Indians, till then concealed

in the thick cane which stood about the cabins. By this fire, one man was killed, and two others wounded, one mortally; the residue, with the women, got into the fort, when, having reached the protection of its walls, one of the wounded men was discovered, left alive on the ground. Captain Logan, distressed for his situation, and keenly alive to the anguish of his family, who could see him from the fort, weltering in his blood, endeavoured in vain, for some time, to raise a party for his rescue. The garrison was, however, so small, and the danger so appalling, that he met only objection and refusal; until John Martin, stimulated by his Captain, proceeded with him to the fort gate. At this instant the wounded man appeared to raise himself on his hands and knees, as if able to help himself, and Martin withdrew, deterred by the obvious hazard. Logan, incapable of abandoning a man under his command, was only nerved to new and more vigorous exertions to relieve the wounded man, who by that time, exhausted by his previous efforts, after crawling a few paces, had fallen to the ground. The generous and gallant Captain took him in his arms amid a shower of bullets, many of which struck the palisades about his head; and brought him into the fort to his despairing family." — *Ibid.* p. 91.

After reading such anecdotes as this, can we wonder at the strong family attachments now existing in Kentucky? The remembrance of such hours of common danger and mutual sacrifice, and generous disregard of self, must have sunk deep into the hearts of those earnest men. "He saved my life at the risk of his own. He helped me bring back my wife from the Indians. He shot the man who was about to dash out my infant's brains." Here was a foundation for friendships, which nothing could root up. "Whispering tongues can poison truth;" but no tongues could do away such evidences of true friendship as these. No subsequent coldness, no after injury could efface their remembrance. They must have been treasured up in the deepest cells of the heart with a sacred gratitude, a religious care. And hence, while Indian warfare developed all the stronger and self-relying faculties, it cultivated also all the sympathies, the confiding trust, the generous affections, which to the present hour are marked on the heart of that people's character.

But besides producing independence and generosity, Indian warfare tended especially to quicken the intellect, making it wakeful to perceive danger and prompt to decide on a way

of meeting it. The whole of the existence of the settlers was a game, which to play, required constant watchfulness and skill, and of which life was the stake. This necessarily gave an activity of intellect and an interest to every thing done or attempted, which, in a safer community, could not be manifested. Life was crowded with action. Every new necessity prompted to new invention. All was animation, vigilance, interest. And such to this hour continues the intellect of Kentucky.

One other element, however, is to be taken into the account. The richness of the soil, and the plentifulness of game, took off the burden of low and narrowing care, and produced a certain freedom of spirit, which is not equally to be looked for in those regions where the whole stress of industry will but barely support life. Around the first settlers of New England, for instance, the horrors of famine were added to the terrors of the Indian yell and tomahawk. A sterner principle was there necessary ; a willingness to endure cold and hunger, no less than dare the attack of the red foe. Such was not the case in Kentucky. Had it been so, the settlement would not have been effected at least for a half century later ; for the motive which induced the enterprise would have been wanting.

The adventures of General George Rogers Clark are given to the public, for the first time, in full detail, in the third, fourth, and fifth chapters of Butler's History. We shall present an abstract of them, both as illustrating the energy of western character, and because we believe they will be new to many of our readers. George Rogers Clark was born in Albemarle county, Virginia, in 1753. In 1775 he first entered Kentucky. He had already been engaged under Lord Dunmore in conflict with the Indians, and now wandered through the scattered settlements, making himself acquainted with the people, and interesting them by his intelligent mind and manly spirit. He is said to have received a command over the Kentucky troops at that time. Returning to Virginia in the fall, he came back to Kentucky in the spring of 1776. Though so young a man, he had inspired so much confidence in the community as to induce them to call a meeting at Harrod's town for the purpose of sending agents to Virginia, to negotiate with that government for assistance, or, if not successful in this, to offer bounties of land for help in men and means from the citizens, and to establish an independent

government. For a mere boy, as we should call him, to form a plan like this, and then to induce a sagacious community to follow it, certainly demonstrates no small powers of reflection and character. This convention met in the absence of Clark, and chose him and another person members of the Assembly of Virginia. They immediately departed through the wilderness to the seat of government. After suffering great hardships they reached Virginia, and found the Assembly adjourned. Clark then went on by himself to Patrick Henry, the Governor, and received from him a letter to the Executive Council. He asked of them five hundred pounds of gunpowder to defend Kentucky. This was refused. The Council offered to lend it to them as friends, but, as they were yet not joined to the State, they could do no more for them. But this young man was not of a temper to yield to opposition lightly. He reflected within himself, and determined to go back to Kentucky and establish there an independent State. With this view, he returned to the council their order, informed them he had no means of conveying the powder through a hostile country, expressed his sorrow that Virginia was unwilling to assist her children, but concluded that they must seek help *elsewhere*, and should no doubt find it. The consequence of this letter was an order for the powder to be delivered at Fort Pitt, for the use of the inhabitants of Kentucky. After this, before leaving Virginia, he succeeded in procuring Kentucky to be erected into a distinct county of that State, and from this time he was established in the affections of the people as their chief counsellor. Hereafter he was to appear as their general and commander.

We pass over the various difficulties which occurred in getting this ammunition conveyed into Kentucky, in order to come to Clark's greatest enterprise. This was the expedition, projected, prepared, and executed by him against the British posts of Kaskaskia and St. Vincent's. The plan, it appears, originated with him ; and is proof in itself of much military talent. Nothing could have been conceived better suited to intimidate the savages and protect the whole frontier of Kentucky, than an effective blow aimed at those posts from whence the Indians derived ammunition, arms, and clothing. It was bold, but yet practicable. The great distance, and the difficulty of transporting soldiers, which seemed at first objections, in fact insured its success, by lulling suspicion, and

giving the final blow an overwhelming character. All this Clark perceived, but, communicating his ideas to no one, he left Kentucky in October, 1777, for Virginia. He laid his plans before Patrick Henry, the Virginia Governor, who, after minutely examining them, and consulting with several gentlemen, at last entered warmly into the project. On the 2d of January, 1778, he received two sets of instructions, one public, directing him to proceed to Kentucky for its defence, and the other secret, ordering an attack on the British post of Kaskaskia. The troops were to be raised west of the mountains, in order not to distract any of the force necessary for the great revolutionary struggle. He descended the river on the 4th of February, from Pittsburg, to the Falls of the Ohio, and there fortified a post on Corn Island, just opposite the present town of Louisville. Here Clark discovered to his troops their real destination to Kaskaskia; and, with the exception of one company who shamefully deserted, all testified satisfaction. The post of St. Vincent's, though nearer, was better fortified, and more difficult to be taken, and Clark's whole available force was now but four companies. On the 24th of June, 1778, the sun being in a total eclipse, the boats passed the Falls. At the mouth of the Tennessee they met a party of hunters, lately from Kaskaskia, who communicated much valuable information with respect to the place. They learned from them, that its defences were such, that, except they could surprise it, their chance of success was small; but, succeeding in this, they would have little difficulty. They were also told, that the French inhabitants of the place entertained great fear of the Americans, being taught by the British to look on them as more barbarous and cruel than the savages. Colonel Clark saw, that by wisely managing this prejudice, and the information he had received on the river, of the treaty between France and the United States, he might be able to secure the assistance of the French; without this he could have little hope of ultimate success. After a difficult march they reached the town on the evening of July 4th, 1778. It was completely surprised, taken possession of, the inhabitants disarmed, and the British Governor secured without a drop of blood being shed. The French submitted to the "Bos-tonais," as they called all Americans at that time, without any resistance.

But, although the town was taken, the work was hardly

begun. The object was to act on the minds of the inhabitants. For this purpose, not force, but judgment and tact were necessary. And the account which Mr. Butler has given of this transaction, taken from original and unquestionable sources, appears to us of such exceeding interest, that we shall proceed to describe it for our readers' entertainment.

Let us imagine then the situation of this ancient place, which contained about two hundred and fifty houses, and had stood for a century and a half in the midst of a blooming prairie, its simple and peaceful French inhabitants dealing only with the Indians, and the present generation of them almost ignorant of any other race. Taught to regard the Americans as monsters of cruelty, they found their town suddenly fallen into their hands. Gloom and fear dwelt visibly on the faces of all. To increase this feeling, Clark commanded all intercourse among the inhabitants, and between them and the soldiers, to cease. For a slight offence against this rule, he commanded several French officers to be put in irons. At last the priest of the village, accompanied by five or six of the oldest inhabitants, came to request permission for the citizens to meet in the church, to take leave of each other. Their property was in the hands of the conquerors, but they hoped they should not be separated from their wives and children, and that some small quantity of provisions and clothes would be allowed them. Clark, seeing that the fears of the people were wound up to the highest point, now determined to let the reaction, which he was aiming at, take place. "For what do you take us, gentlemen;" said he, "for savages? We do not make war on innocence, or helplessness, or women, or children. It was to defend our families, that we took up arms against the British, not for plunder. The French King has now joined us, and the war must soon cease. The people of Kaskaskia, however, may take which side they wish. Neither their property nor families shall suffer." The village was immediately filled with demonstrations of extravagant delight, and as had been expected the inhabitants sided at once with the Americans. A party of them, accompanied by some of Clark's soldiers, went to Cahokia, another post opposite to the present site of St. Louis, and persuaded the French of that place to a like submission and alliance.

All this was very good, but yet was not enough. The post of St. Vincent's lay no great distance off between his present

position and Kentucky, and garrisoned by a force superior to any which Clark could possibly bring against it. Policy, therefore, and not force, must again be resorted to. And here unexpected aid was afforded by the French Priest of Kaskaskia, who was also the spiritual father of the French at St. Vincent's. Always a friend to the Americans, and grateful for the religious toleration showed by Clark, he volunteered to bring over the inhabitants of St. Vincent's to the cause of the Americans without any fighting. Hardly believing it possible, Clark dismissed him on this embassy. The British governor was absent, and M. Gibault succeeded entirely. In two or three days after his arrival, the inhabitants threw off the British government, and, assembling in a body in the church, took the oath of allegiance to Virginia. A commandant was chosen, and the American flag displayed over the fort, to the astonishment of the Indians. The savages were told by their French friends, "that their old Father, the King of France, was come to life again, and was mad with them for fighting for the English; that if they did not wish the land to be bloody with war, they must make peace with the Americans."

Though Clark had effected so much, having taken two important posts from the British, and having won the favor of the French, there was yet another influence to be propitiated, more important and more hostile than either. The business, now more difficult than any thing he had yet accomplished, was to awe or persuade the Indians of the Wabash into an alliance with the Americans. And in this affair he displayed as much sagacity and perseverance as in his previous exploits. The French have invariably succeeded in winning the friendship of the Indians. The English almost as invariably have failed. By an attentive study of the Indian character, Clark had learned to combine the dignity and firmness which awe, with that respectful and ceremonious behaviour which pleases the pride and vanity of the savage. In the treaties held by him at Cahokia and on the Wabash, was displayed the correctness of this view of the Indian. We will extract from Butler a speech of Clark's, in which he explained and simplified to the understanding of the Indians the causes of the war between the United States and England.

"The Big Knife is very much like the red people; they don't know how to make blankets, and powder, and cloth; they buy

these things from the English, from whom they are sprung. They live by making corn, hunting, and trade, as you and your neighbours the French do. But, the Big Knife daily getting more numerous, like the trees in the woods, the land became poor and hunting scarce; and having but little to trade with, the women began to cry at seeing their children naked, and tried to learn how to make clothes for themselves; soon made blankets for their husbands and children; and the men learned to make guns and powder. In this way we did not want to buy so much from the English; they then got mad with us, and sent strong garrisons through our country (as you see they have done among you on the Lakes, and among the French); they would not let our women spin, nor our men make powder, nor let us trade with any body else. The English said we should buy every thing of them, and since we had got saucy, we should give two bucks for a blanket, which we used to get for one; we should do as they pleased, and they killed some of our people to make the rest fear them.

“This is the truth, and the real cause of war between the English and us; which did not take place for some years after this treatment. But our women became cold and hungry, and continued to cry; our young men got lost for want of counsel to put them in the right path. The whole land was dark; the old men held down their heads for shame, because they could not see the sun; and thus there was mourning for many years over the land. At last the Great Spirit took pity on us, and kindled a great council-fire, that never goes out, at a place called Philadelphia; he then stuck down a post, and put a war tomahawk by it, and went away. The sun immediately broke out, the sky was blue again, and the old men held up their heads, and assembled at the fire; they took up the hatchet, sharpened it, and put it into the hands of our young men, ordering them to strike the English, as long as they could find one on this side the great waters. The young men immediately struck the war-post, and blood was shed; in this way the war began, and the English were driven from one place to another, until they got weak, and then they hired your red people to fight for them. The Great Spirit got angry at this, and caused your old father, the French King, and other great nations to join the Big Knife, and fight with them against all their enemies. So the English have become like a deer in the woods; and you may see, that it is the Great Spirit that has caused your waters to be troubled, because you have fought for the people he is mad with. If your women and children should now cry, you must blame yourselves for it, and not the Big Knife. You can now judge who is in the right; I have already told you who I am; here is a bloody belt

and a white one, take which you please. Behave like men, and don't let your being surrounded by the Big Knife cause you to take up one belt with your hands, while your hearts take up the other. If you take the bloody path, you shall leave the town in safety, and may go and join your friends, the English; we will then try like warriors, who can put the most stumbling blocks in each other's way, and keep our clothes longest stained with blood. If, on the other hand, you take the path of peace, and be received as brothers to the Big Knife with their friends, the French, — should you then listen to bad birds that may be flying through the land, you will no longer deserve to be counted as men; but as creatures with two tongues, that ought to be destroyed." — *Ibid.* p. 68.

We also extract an incident which occurred during these negotiations, which Mr. Butler justly regards as of a romantic character. It also is a good specimen of the author's happiest manner.

"A party of Indians, composed of stragglers from various tribes, by the name of Meadow Indians, had accompanied the other tribes, and had been promised a great reward if they would kill Colonel Clark. For this purpose they had pitched their camp about a hundred yards from Clark's quarters, and about the same distance in front of the fort, on the same side of Cahokia creek with the one occupied by the Americans. This creek was about knee-deep at the time, and a plot was formed by some of the Indians to pass the creek after night, fire their guns in the direction of the Indians on the other side of the creek, and then fly to Clark's quarters, where they were to seek admission under pretence of fleeing from their enemies, and put Colonel Clark and the garrison to death. About one o'clock in the morning, while Colonel Clark was still awake with the multiplied cares of his extraordinary situation, the attempt was made; and the flying party, having discharged their guns so as to throw suspicion upon the other Indians, came running to the American camp for protection, as they said, from their enemies, who had attacked them from across the creek. This, the guard, who proved to be in greater force than was anticipated, prevented by presenting their pieces at the fugitives, who were compelled to return to their own camp. The whole town and garrison were now immediately under arms, and these Indians, whom the guard had recognised by moonlight, were sent for, and on being examined, they declared it was their enemies, who had fired upon them from across the creek, and that they had sought shelter among the Americans. Some of the French gentlemen, who knew these

Indians better than the new conquerors, called for a light, and discovered their moccasins and leggins to be quite wet and muddy, from having passed the creek over to the friendly camps. This discovery quite confounded the assassins; and, as there were a great many Indians of other tribes in the town, Clark thought the opportunity favorable to convince them of the closest union between the Americans and the French; he therefore surrendered the culprits to the French, to do what they pleased with them. Secret instructions were, however, given, that the chiefs ought to be sent to the guard-house in irons; these directions were immediately executed.

“In this manacled condition they were brought every day into council, but not suffered to speak until all the other business was transacted, when Colonel Clark ordered their irons to be taken off, and told them every body said they ought to die for their treacherous attempt upon his life, amidst the sacred deliberations of a council. He had determined to inflict death upon them for their base attempt, and they themselves must be sensible that they had justly forfeited their lives; but, on considering the meanness of watching a bear and catching him asleep, he had found out they were not warriors, only old women and too mean to be punished by the Big Knife. ‘But, as you ought to be punished,’ said he, ‘for putting on breech-cloth like men, they shall be taken away from you, plenty of provisions shall be given you for your journey home, as women don’t know how to hunt, and during your stay you shall be treated in every respect as squaws.’ Then without taking any further notice of these offenders, Colonel Clark turned off and began to converse with other persons. This treatment appeared to agitate the offending Indians to their very hearts. In a short time one of their chiefs arose with a pipe and belt of peace, which he offered to Clark, and made a speech; but he would not suffer it to be interpreted, and a sword lying on the table, he took it and indignantly broke the pipe which had been laid before him, declaring the Big Knife never treated with women. The offending tribe then appeared busy in conversation among themselves; when suddenly two of their young men advanced into the middle of the floor, sat down, and flung their blankets over their heads, to the astonishment of the whole assembly, when two chiefs arose, and, with a pipe of peace, stood by the side of these victims, and offered their lives to Colonel Clark, as an atonement for the offence of the tribe. They hoped this sacrifice would appease the Big Knife, and they again offered the pipe. Clark would not yet admit a reconciliation with them, but directed them in a milder tone than before to be seated, for he would have nothing to say to them. After keeping them

some time longer in suspense, Colonel Clark, deeply affected by the magnanimity of these rude sons of the forest, ordered the young men to rise and uncover themselves, said he was glad to find there were men in all nations, and through them granted peace to their tribe." — *Ibid.* p. 72.

By means of such cautious management Clark succeeded in undermining the British influence among the Indian tribes from the Mississippi to the Lakes, and impressing them with a respect for the Americans hitherto unknown. One military exploit remained for him to perform, as the crowning glory of this singular campaign. He had for some time been anxious with respect to St. Vincent's, in which he had been unable to post any American troops, though it had been put under the command of one of his captains. And on the 29th of January, 1779, he received news that Governor Hamilton had marched a force against it from Detroit, and had reduced it again under the power of the British. Had he continued his march to Kaskaskia, with his four hundred Indians brought from Detroit, he would probably have overpowered the small force of Clark. But, as winter was advanced, he thought this impracticable, and let his Indians scatter themselves, intending to re-assemble his forces in the spring, and march on Kaskaskia, where he was to be joined by seven hundred Indians from the north and south. With this force, beside his own and some artillery, he intended to sweep Kentucky as far as Fort Pitt, and entertained no doubt of success. But when opposed to an enemy like Clark, his delay was fatal. Notwithstanding the inclemency of the season, that officer immediately resolved on marching against St. Vincent's, — "for," said he, "I knew if I did not take him, he would take me." He despatched a boat with forty-six men and the artillery found at Kaskaskia up the Wabash river, to wait below the town for further orders. He then commenced his march with one hundred and seventy men, of whom two French companies made a part, across the drowned lands of the Wabash, for St. Vincent's. This was in the month of February, and the march carried them through places where the water was two and three feet deep for miles, and in some places up to their armpits. To keep up the spirits and courage of the troops under such exhausting hardships required great exertion on the part of their commander. In about a fortnight they reached St. Vincent's. After a contest of one or two days between the cannon of the fort and Clark's rifles, the latter had such a decided superiority that

the post was surrendered, with seventy-nine British soldiers prisoners of war, and considerable stores. The rifle had the whole honor of reducing their strong fort, for the artillery had not arrived. The peremptory and commanding manners of Clark, conveying the impression that his power was much greater than it was, had a large share in this result. Indeed, in perusing the accounts of his decided and inflexible conduct in negotiation, and remembering the stern, unmoved expression of brow, eye, cheek, and mouth in the portraits of him, which are common in Kentucky, we gain from the simple record and the caricature of the unskilful artist the idea of a man, before whose look few could stand unmoved. Such was this Kentuckian, and such were other Kentuckians. These were the events which were passing on the frontier, while the Revolutionary war was raging on the Atlantic coast.

We pass over some years and come to another period of Kentucky history. The country has become more populous ; the danger from Indians has almost gone by ; the forest is felled.

“ The wars are all over,
The sword it hangs idle,
The steed bites the bridle
And stands in the stall.
We drink — but what ’s drinking ?
A mere pause from thinking ;
No bugle awakes us with life-and-death call.”

The activity of mind, the love of excitement, the restless, adventurous spirit remains, while the field on which it was exercised is removed. It must display itself in another way ; it must find some other channel of action. And thus Kentucky becomes the theatre of the most daring political schemes. Accustomed to act on a wide scale, these people cannot sit down contented with the natural proceeds of a rich soil, and the natural comforts of a temperate climate. Not satisfied, like the inhabitants of other States and sections, with the local prosperity of their own little villages and counties, they contemplate the interests of the whole Valley and the destinies of the coming age. They find themselves on navigable streams, which bind together tens of thousands of miles of country.*

* The endless ramifications of the mammoth River of the West has made more specific terms necessary in speaking of its tributaries. In New England we have only *brooks* and *rivers*. But in the West we hear of a *branch*, of a *run*, of a *fork*, of a *creek*, of a river which empties into the Ohio, which falls into the Mississippi.

Distance vanishes. Those who live a hundred miles from them are their neighbours. They immediately take a broad view of their inheritance and its value, and only one thing is necessary to make their wilderness the garden of the earth. *The navigation of the Mississippi* is absolutely necessary to them. They fix their hearts on it. They must, they will, possess a free trade upon its broad bosom. The most ignorant boatman, the poorest farmer, understands its importance. An enthusiastic and lightly moved people are excited against the government by what they consider its neglect of their rights and delay in attending to their petitions. Jay's proposition to Congress to cede the navigation of the river to Spain for twenty years, roused a violent feeling of indignation against himself and his party. Disorganizers and ambitious men took advantage of this state of feeling, and hence arose what has been known as the *Spanish conspiracy*.

The ascertained facts in relation to the Spanish conspiracy, as stated by Butler, are these. In the year 1788, under the old confederation, John Brown, the Representative to Congress from the district of Kentucky, had certain private conferences with Don Gardequoï, the Spanish minister. In consequence of which he writes letters to the President of the convention held at Danville, and to Judge Muter, in which he informs them that if Kentucky will separate from the Union and establish an independent government, Spain is ready to give to them the free navigation of the Mississippi. At this very time, Kentucky was petitioning Congress through the mouth of this very John Brown, to be admitted into the Union as an independent State. After this, at another convention at Danville, General Wilkinson, a leading man in Kentucky in those days, stands up, and proposes the establishment of an independent State, which should treat with Spain separately for the navigation of the Mississippi, *and find its way into the Union afterwards*. Thereupon the same John Brown gets up and tells the convention, as the Spanish organ in that body, that, if they can be unanimous in the adoption of Wilkinson's measure, Spain will grant them whatever they wish. But the people were not ripe for such a step, though their leaders evidently were so, and the convention parted without adopting any separating measure. The admission of Kentucky into the Union as an independent State terminated, for a season, these inclinations.

This was in 1778. In 1795, according to Mr. Butler's

division, began the second part of the affair. In that year, while negotiations are going forward in Madrid, to secure the much-desired navigation of the Mississippi, Governor Carondelet writes to Judge Sebastian, a judge of the Court of Appeals, and who it afterwards appeared was a hired and pensioned partisan of Spain, by one Power, informing him that the Spanish king was desirous of opening the Mississippi to the western States, and establishing a commercial treaty with them. Sebastian communicated this proposal to Innes, Judge of the United States Court, William Murray, and Colonel Nicholas, influential citizens of Kentucky, and by their advice goes to New Orleans, arranges the terms of the treaty, and is on the point of concluding it, when news arrives of the treaty between Spain and the United States at Madrid. This induces the Spanish governor, in opposition to the urgent entreaty of Judge Sebastian, to break off the negotiation.

In 1797 it recommences. Power comes from New Orleans with a proposition to Sebastian, Innes, Nicholas, and Murray, "to withdraw from the Federal Union, and form a government wholly unconnected with that of the United States." To aid in this, orders for one or two hundred thousand dollars on the royal treasury at New Orleans, were offered to those who would engage in this scheme, together with arms and equipments, twenty field-pieces, powder, ball, &c. After deliberation between Sebastian, Innes, and Nicholas, they conclude that the proposition is dangerous, and ought to be rejected. And so the affair terminated.

None of the gentlemen concerned in these negotiations seemed to have felt their obligation to give information of these treasonable designs till the year 1806. In that year, an inquiry was ordered to be made into the conduct of Judge Sebastian by the Kentucky legislature. He had contrived to hold the office of Judge of Appeals to that day. Then the circumstances of his pension from Spain were revealed by the testimony of Judge Innes, who assigns reasons taken from party politics for not having done his duty in revealing the intrigues before. He was of the party opposed to John Adams's administration, he says ; he was suspected by him, and he might suffer, either from him, or from the people's thinking him to be courting favor with that administration. Miserable reasons for neglecting a public duty. Mr. Butler, however, thinks them sufficient, and calls the omission, by what we think

a somewhat badly chosen term, "a theoretical fault." This theoretical fault is usually known, we believe, by the harder name of misprision of treason.

From these facts, taken wholly from Mr. Butler, who is evidently disposed to shield the actors in them as far as possible from censure, it appears evident, that most of the leading men in Kentucky, through a long course of years, were in favor of separating from the Union, and establishing an independent government, and took every measure in their power to bring this about. Let us now turn to another similar attempt, made in the interval between the first and second Spanish negotiation, by the notorious Frenchman, Genet.

In the year 1793, in the midst of that democratic fever which raged through the land, and in which Kentucky largely shared, he sent four individuals into that State with the avowed purpose of organizing an expedition against New Orleans. Two of these men have the impudence to write to Governor Shelby from a place close to his own door, asking him whether he shall interfere with their operations. He gives them a cautious answer, in which he says he shall be compelled to do his duty. They however go on to raise two thousand men under French authority, to distribute French commissions, buy cannon, &c. They give G. R. Clark a commission of Major-General in the armies of France. The veteran is dazzled by this title, and yields. He issues proposals for raising an army. In the mean time the Secretary of State, General St. Clair, and General Wayne write to Governor Shelby, informing him of these proceedings and urging him to interfere. He writes an answer to the Secretary, full of doubts as to his constitutional right to prevent citizens from going on this expedition. In consequence President Washington issues a proclamation, admonishing all citizens of the United States to abstain from these measures. Soon after, Genet is superseded, and the attempt relinquished. Part of the letter of La Chaise on this occasion may be inserted as a curiosity.

"To the Democratic Society of Lexington.

"CITIZENS,

"Events unforeseen, the effects of causes which it is unnecessary here to develope, have stopped the march of two thousand brave Kentuckians, who, strong in their courage, in the

justice of their rights, their cause, the general assent of their fellow citizens, and convinced of the brotherly dispositions of the Louisianians, waited only for their orders to go, and, by the strength of their arms, take from the Spaniards, despotic usurpers, the empire of the Mississippi, ensure to their country the navigation of it, break the chains of the Americans, and their brethren the French, hoist up the flag of liberty in the name of the French Republic, and lay the foundation of the prosperity and happiness of two nations, destined by nature to be but one, the most happy in the universe." *

Here again we see distinguished citizens of Kentucky, such men as Shelby and Clark, underrating or overlooking the duties which they owed to the Federal government, in a mad sympathy with French Republicanism. Mr. Butler attempts to defend Governor Shelby for the course taken by him in this matter, and Judge Hall passes over it with his usual easy negligence. We have no desire to injure that governor's venerable name. He was in heart a patriot, but in head he greatly erred. He confesses, that he thought it a favorable opportunity, when the mind of Washington was alarmed by foreign intrigues, to gain for Kentucky, through his fear of losing it, privileges which could not otherwise be secured. We cannot hold this to be the part of a patriotic citizen of the United States. Butler laments the conduct of Clark, and does not seek to justify his hero. For him this only excuse can be proffered, that "he was a man of war from his youth," and not used to weighing the niceties of international law.

So it has ever been with the people of Kentucky. Easily led away by artful and insinuating demagogues, they have commonly seen their character, in time to draw back. The whole enthusiasm of the State went with Burr for a season, and enabled him quietly to defy the honest efforts of J. H. Daviess † to arrest his treasonable undertakings. A grand jury declared they found no testimony which could, in the smallest degree, criminate him ; this decision was received with shouts of joy by the spectators in the court ; and a public ball was given him in honor of his triumph.

* Journal of the Kentucky Assembly, 1806. Proceedings on the trial of Judge Sebastian.

† Who was soon after turned out of office by Jefferson. He had called him a "milk-and-water President" in the streets of Frankfort.

All the traits of character we have attempted to delineate were displayed again in full activity during the last war. The "hunters of Kentucky" were in every battle, from Niagara to New Orleans. Those who fell with the generous Daviess at Tippacanoe; who fought by the side of their aged governor, Shelby, and charged with Johnson at the Thames; or who were in that desperate struggle where the sound of the musketry and battle-shouts were swallowed up in the deep roar of the cataract on whose verge they fought,—these all carried with them the native genius of their country.*

A genius deep, rich, strong, various, and full of promise. But as yet it is unbridled, undirected, and ungoverned. If its faults sometimes lean to virtue's side, its virtues as often hurry into faults. The activity of mind which should be employed on great and noble enterprises, wastes itself away in trifling amusements and indolent conviviality. For fear of using Puritanical restraint, the child is left to go his own way to destruction. Mothers encourage their children to fight with their companions, and praise their spirit when they display passion and anger. The death of those children, stabbed or shot in some wild fray, is too often the terrible result of such early lessons. Young ladies lavish their favor and approbation on the *chivalric*, and give their smiles to the lawless reprobate who glories in the murders he has committed on the *field of honor*. Over the corpse of their own chosen one, they may afterward bewail, with unavailing repentance, their guilty encouragement of those who break God's most sacred laws. Gray-haired men, judges, counsellors, and statesmen, to whom the country naturally looks for example, are known to spend days and nights at the gaming-table. What wonder that this vice should eat into the very heart of social virtue, and sweep into ruin the fairest promise of the land? What wonder if they are called to lay in a dishonored grave the son whom their own example has destroyed?

* We are sorry to see, that Mr. Butler, in speaking of Hull's surrender of Detroit, applies as usual the words "dastardly" and "cowardly" to that old revolutionary soldier, without alluding to his "Letters on the Northwestern Campaign," and the singular facts there developed. It is the duty of the historian to do careful justice to the memories of those who have died heart-broken under the weight of public contumely, and the dark cloud of shame and dishonor. At all events, such epithets should not be applied, without so much as an allusion to a book, which caused a decided change of opinion through a great part of the Union.

Of force and impetus there is enough in the western character ; all that is lacking is direction. The ship has enough of headway, she only needs to be skilfully steered. Religious restraint is needed, moral principle is needed, wise guidance is needed. A deep reverence for truth, a profound respect for law, a ready submission to right, a loyal allegiance to duty, these will make the western character as perfect as humanity can ever hope to become.

ART. II. — *Georgii Washingtonii, Americæ Septentrionalis Civitatum Fœderatarum Præsidis Primi, Vita, Francisco Glass, A. M., Ohioensi, Litteris Latinis conscripta. Neo-Eboracopoli ; typis fratrum Harperorum. 1835.*

FRANCIS GLASS, the author of this life of Washington, was educated, as we are informed by the editor, Mr. Reynolds, in Philadelphia ; and spent the earlier part of his life in that city and vicinity, in literary pursuits. Afterwards, he resided some time in the interior of Pennsylvania, and then removed to Ohio ; where, in a secluded spot, oppressed with domestic discomfort, and surrounded by all the ills of poverty, he was employed in school-keeping ; teaching those, who, for the most part, were acquiring the simplest rudiments of an English education. Glass seems to have possessed much sensibility, a preparation not always the most effectual for contending against the ills of life ; but adversity did not entirely break his spirit. In circumstances the most unfavorable for mental effort, he continued to cherish the favorite studies of his youth ; and though removed from books and learned men, he was not beyond the reach of literary ambition. He early formed the plan, suggested, no doubt, by his occupation, of preparing a life of Washington in Latin, for the use of schools ; and in spite of numerous discouragements, and with few of the necessary helps for writing this language with a proper regard to authorities, especially in treating of modern transactions, he at length brought his contemplated work to a conclusion. To Mr. Reynolds, who had been his pupil, and who afterwards generously acted towards him the part of a patron, he de-